

THE
MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. II.]

BOSTON, APRIL, 1861.

[No. 4.

THE ORTHODOX DOCTRINE OF EVERLASTING
PUNISHMENT. — No. II.

Review of Dr. Joseph Thompson's book on "Love and Penalty; or, Eternal Punishment consistent with the Fatherhood of God."

IN our last number, we examined at some length the common Orthodox doctrine of eternal punishment, especially as set forth by Dr. Adams of this city. We now propose to add some remarks upon a recent work by Dr. Thompson of New York, a zealous and favorite disciple of the late Dr. Taylor of New Haven. This book, the title of which is "Love and Penalty," consists of nine lectures delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, and printed at the request of forty-three men who listened to the lectures, and wished to have them printed, because they say that these lectures contain the best "refutation" of some "sophistical views" which they think have been lately advanced "in some popular monthlies and by some leading men." We do not observe the name of any woman signed to this letter. Possibly, however, in Dr. Thompson's church, women are not expected to sign letters, any more than to speak. There is no table of contents

nor any index to this volume. We will, therefore, give the subjects of the lectures and their contents, before proceeding to an examination of them.

The subjects of the lectures are, "Divine retribution argued from the constitution of the human mind; future retribution argued from the course of Providence in this world; future retribution argued from the Fatherhood of God in Christ; future retribution argued from the demerit of sin; no future probation revealed or probable; the immortality of the soul; eternal punishment a doctrine of the Bible; punishment, not annihilation, the future portion of the ungodly; the paternal character of God a pledge that he will punish sin."

With the contents of some of these chapters we have nothing to do. All the arguments for retribution, derived from the nature of God, the nature of man, the course of Providence, the demerit of sin, have for their object to prove what all Christians fully believe. Unitarians and Universalists, Theodore Parker and R. W. Emerson, teach retribution, present and future, with a force which leaves little need of additional arguments from Orthodoxy. They teach a perfect and inevitable retribution, proceeding both from the truth and goodness of God, by means of which every man reaps as he sows. Orthodoxy, they complain, teaches no such full and perfect retribution. All that part of this volume, therefore, which is intended to show the probability of retribution, is wasted, so far as any opposers are concerned. In this part of his book, Dr. Thompson fights as one who beats the air. He is very zealous to disprove that which no one asserts, to prove that which no one denies, and to show the folly of a position which no one assumes. A large part of his book is thus occupied; and this seems to be the part in which the signers of the letter are particularly interested, and for the sake of which they

wished to have it published. They say, "We cannot withhold the expression of our appreciation of the series of sabbath-evening discourses, delivered by you, on *the future punishment of the wicked, as consistent with the paternal character of God.*" Now, that the future punishment of the wicked is consistent with the paternal character of God, is the very thing for which we all contend.

The confusion referred to runs through the whole book; and perhaps there is no better illustration than this volume presents, of that logical fallacy which is called "the irrelevant conclusion." This fallacy consists in proving one thing, and making men think you have proved another. Dr. Thompson's hearers saw that he proved future retribution, and thought that he proved eternal punishment. We do not suppose that he intended to sophisticate them: the difficulty seems rather to be, that he has sophisticated himself. The *ignoratio elenchi* is in his own mind. He thinks, because he sees penalty, that he has seen vengeance; that, because he has established retribution, he has demonstrated everlasting punishment.

A reasoner has, no doubt, a perfect right to try to prove two distinct and independent propositions; but he must keep them distinct and independent, and not pretend to be proving one when he is proving the other. He has also a perfect right, if he desires to establish one proposition, to prove another, as the first step toward it; but he has no right to assume or imply that he has made out one of his points, when he has only shown the probability of the other.

Now, our author (p. 19) declares that he has one object; viz., to show the truth of the doctrine of everlasting punishment. He says, "It will be the aim of this series of lectures to show that *the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked is in entire harmony with the paternal*

character of God." He then proceeds to give the substance of his argument, under eight heads. Six of these only prove future retribution, and only two of them have any direct bearing upon the main question. Yet, through all of them, there runs a quiet assumption, that they are bearing directly on the main question. This is the radical sophism of the whole volume. We may see this more plainly by analyzing some of his chapters.

His first position is this, in Lecture I.: "Our own nature, which is appealed to as refusing to recognize the attribute of punitive justice in a God of love, in fact demands this attribute, as essential to the moral perfection of the Deity; an attribute without which he could not command the confidence and homage of his intelligent creatures."

Before attempting to demonstrate any theorem, it is important to define its terms. An accurate definition at first of what we wish to prove would often make a long discussion unnecessary. What is meant by the "*attribute of punitive justice*"? Does it mean that God's nature is such that he causes happiness to flow from goodness, and suffering from wickedness, in the constitution of the universe? If this is meant, Dr. Thompson will find no one to oppose him; for all this can take place in perfect accordance with Divine Love to the sinner himself. What he *needs* is suffering: this is the way by which he is to be cured of that sin which is a greater evil than suffering. Or does the author mean, by "punitive justice," some attribute of the Divine Nature which finds pleasure in punishing the sinner, without regard to any good which is to come from it, either to him or to any one else? Apparently, this last is what he means; for he goes on to quote from Pagan authorities and Pagan religions, to show that conscience in man requires that the wicked should be punished, without any regard to any good to result from it. But

these authorities only show, that, in the one-sided action of man's nature, the sense of justice acts independently of love. What Dr. Thompson has undertaken to show is, that it can act in God in harmony with love. In man, conscience produces hatred of sin, without regard to the good of the sinner; but the Divine Conscience acts in no such one-sided way. "Mercy and truth meet together; righteousness and peace kiss each other." The law is vindicated and the sinner benefited at the same moment.

The atonement of Christ, objectively considered, consisted exactly in this, that he showed a perfect reconciliation, in his own life, of God's hatred to sin, and love to the sinner. No one was ever so averse from sin, no one was ever so in sympathy with the sinner, as Jesus. The power of his life, death, and higher life, lay in this union of holiness and love. This was the objective atonement in Christ, and in this he was God manifest in the flesh. He who has seen him has seen the Father. The Christianized conscience, following Christ, pities the sinner, while it abhors the sin. Christian legislation lays aside the vindictive tendencies of natural law, and seeks at the same time to destroy evil, to protect society, and to reform the criminal. From this gospel view our author remands us to Paganism, and to the dicta of the natural conscience in unregenerate man. These testimonies only show, that conscience, in its unregenerate state, demands that the sinner be punished; and does not care whether that punishment does him good or harm, makes him better or worse. But conscience, when Christianized, does care: it wishes to save the sinner, while it punishes the sin. As far as the natural conscience goes, it speaks truly in saying that evil should follow sin. But why it should follow it, and what shall be the result, it does not say. That was left to Christ to reveal.

Dr. Thompson himself bears witness, unconsciously, to the truth of this distinction. Along with his testimonies from the Heathen conscience, he gives us two testimonies from the Christian conscience. The one is his own feelings on seeing a woman carried to the Tombs. He says he felt sympathy for her, and would fain have saved her from that shame, while he wished her crime to be punished. The other is the testimony of Dr. Bushnell, that the "necessary reason" why wicked people, remaining wicked, should not be in heaven, is, that it would destroy the happiness of heaven. These two Christians, therefore, have consciences which do not testify to punishment proceeding from naked, arbitrary, and vindictive law, such as the Pagan conscience accepts; but punishment having a reasonable end, a benevolent purpose, and accompanied with sympathy for the sinner.

In the second lecture there is nothing to be answered. It is merely a statement that suffering comes in this world to men providentially, and that its object is "punitive." Using the word in the sense given above, we agree with our author, that much present suffering is punitive; while some is for warning, some for discipline, and all for good.

Nor is it necessary that we should say any thing about the third lecture, so far as it refers to God's judgments upon Israel; since these were all for educational purposes, intended to discipline their characters, destroy idolatry, and make the people fit for Christ's coming.

The fourth position is, that Christ himself "*teaches that God will punish the wicked in a future world.*" This, also, we fully believe; and we cannot see that God's love can do any thing better for the wicked than this. God punishes in the other world, as in this world, not for his pleasure, but for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness.

The next position of Dr. Thompson is, however, so extraordinary, that it needs more consideration. His fifth proposition is this: "*The high and sacred Fatherhood which the gospel reveals is a Fatherhood in Christ towards those who love him, and not a general Fatherhood of indiscriminate love and blessing for the race.*"

A certain want of logical clearness in our author's mind appears in the very statement of this proposition. He joins together a positive and a negative, which have no antithetical relation. We entirely agree with him, that the Fatherhood of God is *not* one of *indiscriminate* love and blessing for the race; but we utterly reject the proposition, that the Fatherhood which Christ reveals is only one towards those who love him. The Apostle John tells us that "we love him because he first loved us." And again: "Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." The doctrine of the apostle is exactly opposite to that of Dr. Thompson. The modern divine teaches that God only loves those who first love him; but the ancient divine teaches that only by God's loving us first do we come to love him. Nor is this doctrine peculiar to John. It is a fundamental truth of the New Testament, that God's fatherly love, manifested to the soul, creates an answering love, and that nothing else can create it. Jesus said of the woman, "She loved much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little." God's forgiving love comes first, and creates a grateful love in return. And again we read (John iii. 16): "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son." He therefore loved the world while it was still alienated from him. And again: we are told by the Saviour (Matt. v. 44) to "love our enemies, that we may be the children of our Father in heaven," who loves his enemies.

Possibly our friend may say, "Yes, God loves the sinner; but he does not love him with a *fatherly* love, but only with a general love." Perhaps a copy of the New Testament may be used in the Tabernacle Church, New York, which does not contain the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Only on some such supposition can we account for this assertion of Dr. Thompson, that "the high and sacred Fatherhood which the gospel reveals is a Fatherhood in Christ toward those who love him." Is that "*high and sacred Fatherhood of God*" revealed anywhere more fully and plainly than in this parable? and does it not teach expressly that the father loved the son, while he was absent, as a son? Is not his joy at the return of his son the evidence of that love which clung to him while he was away? Even after the son returned, he had not begun to love his father as a son: he did not think he had any right to do so. He did not expect that his father would love him again: he only expected to be as a servant. It is evidently, then, utterly false to say that God's Fatherhood, revealed in the gospel, is only a Fatherhood towards those who love him: it is a Fatherhood to those who hate him and to those who fear him. His love creates theirs, and is not created by it. Such a doctrine as this of Dr. Thompson, if generally believed, would sap the foundations of Christian life, and turn the gospel of reconciling grace into a cold system of retribution.

As a proof of this melancholy opinion, — an opinion which takes the life out of the gospel, — the author relies chiefly on that passage in which Jesus says to the Jews that they were of their father the Devil (John viii. 44). From this he argues that they had no right to regard God as Father, and that no one has that right except pious believers in Christ. But was not God at that very moment their Father, in the same way that the father of the

prodigal son was his father while he was yet in the far country? The prodigal son could not see his father's love: while absent from him, he could not tell how much his father loved him. Only when he returned, and came back to his father's house, could he behold that blessed countenance and feel that pardoning love. But none the less did his father love him during all that absence; none the less did he desire his return.

When Jesus said to the unbelieving Jews, "Ye are of your father the Devil," was he describing God's state of mind, or their state of mind? Did he mean that God was alienated from them, or that they were alienated from God? He evidently meant to say that they were in a *devilish* state of mind; that in their character and feelings they partook of the spirit of the Devil, and not of the spirit of God. He was describing their position in relation to God, not God's position in relation to them. The text, therefore, appears to have no direct bearing on the subject. It teaches, indeed, that they could have no truly filial feeling toward God; but it does not show that He might not have a truly parental feeling toward them. If they could not truly say, "Abba, Father," He could say, "My son, give me thy heart."

We dwell on this because our author seems to us to have assumed a position injurious, if not fatal, to the most vital force of the gospel. That which subdues and converts the heart, and makes all things new in the soul, is not to be told, that God will be our Father when we love him, but that he is our Father now. "Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us." — "God commends his love toward us, that, *while we were sinners*, Christ died for us." But why multiply quotations to prove that which is written on the face of the gospel, and to which all Christian experience bears testimony? It is God's love to us,

descending in Christ, while we are estranged and far off, which draws up our affection to him: it is not our love which takes the initiative, and draws his down.

The sixth position argues future retribution from the demerit of sin, and asserts that "no punishment equal to the demerit of sin is, or can be, inflicted in the present life."

The boldness of this proposition is only equalled by the poverty of the reasoning by which it is supported. To assert that it is not in the power of God adequately to punish sin in this world, is to profess a knowledge of the resources of Omnipotence, and an acquaintance with the deserts of man, which it seems to us presumptuous to claim. On this point it is not necessary to enlarge. An *à-priori* argument, to prove that God cannot punish sin in this life as much as it deserves to be punished, can carry conviction to no mind which possesses any intellectual humility.

The seventh position declares that "there is no conceivable mode and no revealed promise by which the Fatherhood of God can make one, dying in impenitence and unbelief, holy and blessed in the future world."

This is, of course, the very keystone of the argument in support of the doctrine of everlasting punishment. The burden of proof rests upon those who assert that doctrine. It is not enough that Scripture does not expressly declare that there is an opportunity in the other life for repentance and pardon; for Scripture is dealing with us in this life, and has no occasion to say much of the opportunities of the other. Those who wish to prove that there is no opportunity hereafter must show some text which expressly declares it. No such text is produced, and there is no such text in the Bible. If Jesus had said, "You must repent in this life, for, after death, there will be no opportunity;" or, "At death, man's spiritual condition is finally determined;" or, "After this life, man cannot turn from

evil to good," — we should have some distinct proof of the doctrine. But now we have none.

The parable of Dives and Lazarus is referred to more than once by our author in support of his position. It is sufficient to say in regard to this, that the most Orthodox commentators, provided they are scholars, expressly deny that this refers to the doctrine of everlasting punishment. Olshausen, for instance, says, "Rightly to understand the whole delineation, we must, above all, keep clearly in view, that it is not everlasting salvation or condemnation which is here described, but the middle state of departed souls, between death and the resurrection." — "In our parable, there is no possible reference to the everlasting condemnation of the rich man, inasmuch as the germ of love, and of faith in love, is clearly expressed in his words." The word translated "hell" in this parable is not Gehenna, but Hades.

Our author says, and says justly, that we can form no opinion as to another probation hereafter from *à-priori* reasoning, but that the question must be answered only from Scripture. Having said this, he immediately proceeds to argue it *à priori*, stating that there are only three conceivable modes by which those dying impenitent can be saved; and then tries to show that neither is possible. After this, he quotes a few passages bearing only indirectly and by inference upon the question. The Parable of the Ten Virgins is one of these, because in it it is said, "The door is shut;" and, "Depart! I know you not." With regard to this parable, also, Olshausen says that "the words 'I know you not' cannot denote eternal condemnation;" that the foolish virgins were "saved, but not sanctified;" and that the parable does not distinguish between the penitent and the impenitent, but between the penitent believers who watch and those who do not watch.

We have not space, nor is it necessary, to examine all the texts referred to; for not one of them asserts distinctly the point to be proved. The arguments of a general nature not derived from Scripture have no weight, according to our author's own confession. We therefore proceed to consider, finally, the arguments under his last proposition; viz., that eternal punishment is a doctrine of the Bible.

The first text is 2 Thess. i. 7-11. It is only necessary to say of this, that it refers, by our author's own admission, to the "coming of the Lord" (also spoken of in Matthew, chap. xxiv., xxv.); and that, in regard to this "coming," our Lord himself distinctly says, in language about which there can be no possible mistake, nor chance for cavil, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." These events have, therefore, all taken place. The "everlasting destruction" here spoken of and the "everlasting punishment" (Matt. xxv. 46) must mean the judgments which took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. We have Christ's own most solemn assertion that this is so. All these things, including his coming in the clouds of heaven, sending out his angels with a great sound of the trumpet, gathering his elect from the four winds, were to take place before the generation to which he spoke should pass away. What sort of respect for Scripture, then, has that writer, who transfers all this from the past to the future, and makes it refer to a coming judgment in the other world? Dr. Thompson objects to our explaining these things as being figures referring to spiritual punishments and moral judgments. He must, then, be prepared to assert, either that Christ was mistaken in saying (Matt. xxiv. 34), "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled;" and (Matt. xvi. 28), "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom," — or to say that Christ at that time

came visibly and literally in the clouds of heaven, with the great sound of a literal trumpet, and with visible angels.

Of course, we have not been able to notice all the arguments of this book, or all the texts referred to; but we have perhaps said enough to show that its positions are not all tenable, and that its arguments are not absolutely unanswerable. This book of Dr. Thompson, though able, cannot be called conclusive.

"THE BOSTON REVIEW."

THIS is a new theological bi-monthly, each number containing about a hundred pages, at three dollars a year. Its prospectus says that it is "given in answer to an extensive and increasing demand for a New-England organ of the Puritan theology. Believing that Calvin, the Westminster divines, and Edwards furnish the best human symbols of Christian doctrine, it is the design of this 'Review' to keep both their terms and their original import living and fresh before the church of our time."

This is declared to be the chief aim of the "Review." To keep Calvin "in his terms and original import" "living," and to keep the Westminster divines "fresh," and to do this "*before*" the church of our time, — this, whatever it may mean, is the chief aim. But, while keeping "the original import" of Calvin, &c., "fresh" (which we have no doubt is a very important thing to do), we are glad to see that it also proposes to "give attention to philosophy, literature, biblical investigations, and social questions."

Considering the chief aim of this "Review" as above stated, and observing that, as yet, no motto has been found for it, we offer as our humble contribution the following one from Ezek. xxxvii. 1-3:—

"The Spirit of the Lord set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones; and, lo, they were very dry. And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God! thou knowest. Again he said unto me, Prophecy upon these bones, and say unto them, O ye dry bones! hear the word of the Lord."

It strikes us that this will be a highly appropriate motto for a "Review" which proposes as its chief aim to make the Westminster divines, &c., "living and fresh;" and we cheerfully furnish this motto, from a grateful sense of the interest which the editors have shown in our own denomination: for, in this very first number of their "Review," they have exhibited a profound sympathy with our labors; an admiration hitherto unsuspected for our eminent men; and a desire, such as we should never have dared to attribute to them, that the Unitarian denomination should not injure itself by an injudicious selection of men for its offices. Indeed, the "Review" carries its tender interest in our affairs so far as to care even for our grammar, our rhetoric, and our printers' errors. For all which we desire to feel duly grateful.

We here refer particularly to the third article, entitled "Who was Theodore Parker?" The main object of this article seems to be, first, to show that Mr. Parker was a very wicked man; and, secondly, to show that the Unitarians have injured themselves by allowing those who think and speak well of him to be in good standing with their denomination. And the more especial object and final aim of the article is, to show the Unitarians the injury which they do themselves by having as the Secretary of their

Association one who loved and honored Mr. Parker, while dissenting from his Christology and Anthropology.

It is curious to notice how dislike for one man will produce the appearance of liking for another man. Hatred to one causes a show of love for another. Thus A dislikes B, and abuses him; but presently he meets C, whom he dislikes more. And now B seems to him a very good sort of fellow: he would even wish to unite with B in putting down C; though it is likely, that, after C was put down, B would become again the main object of his dislike.

This principle is especially apparent in the case of heresies. Heresy-hunters like a good new heresy to attack. They get tired of hunting the old one. Heresy-hunters resemble the bull in the Spanish bull-fight, who can always be diverted from his attack on one *picador* by a fresh one who calls attention from the first. No one now thinks of abusing Quakers or Baptists; though these, when their heresies were new, were the objects of the most furious and bitter persecution. The last heresy makes former ones seem quite respectable.

It therefore does not surprise us, that the Unitarians, who, like Dr. Channing and Henry Ware, were formerly objects of bitter attack, should now be almost eulogized by the very men who once denounced them. We recollect, for example, a violent assault on the late Henry Ware, jun., by a gentleman who is reported to be the writer of this article. And now see how well the "Review" speaks of these very men, approving both their minds and their hearts:—

"Dr. Channing is gathered to his fathers; Rev. Henry Ware, jun. (a beautiful specimen of mind and heart), has gone, with Buckminster and Greenwood, to the grave: but their characters and attainments were an endowment sufficient to enrich a denomination, and make it respected for half a century, if that denomination could live so long,

even if no one name should, during that time, appear as a central, controlling influence in that communion."

Thus the whirligig of time brings about its revenges. Dr. Channing and Mr. Ware would, we think, be somewhat surprised at praise from such a quarter.

A good deal of pains appears to have been taken, by this writer, about the Secretaryship of the Unitarian Association. This matter occupies him not a little. One object of the article, indeed, seems to have been to convince the "choice spirits" who compose the Board of the Unitarian Association, that they are unequally yoked together with the present incumbent of that office, and that they ought to try to get rid of him. "Disavowing all personal feeling," the writer asks, "Who is the present Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, and editor of their 'Monthly Journal'? Their Board of Officers is composed of men, the most of whom are choice spirits; but who is the Secretary?" To comfort the inquiring mind of this anxious writer, and to show him that his labor in this behalf is unnecessary, we will inform him that the term for which the present officer consented to serve has nearly expired, and that he will not probably be a candidate for re-election. In due season, it is likely that some of the "choice spirits" of the Board will call at the office of the "Boston Review" to get this writer's advice as to the Secretary's successor.

We have mentioned already, that our writer, who is a universal genius, takes an interest in Unitarian grammar and rhetoric, as well as in Unitarian theology and Unitarian Secretaries. It grieves him that we should say "live knowledge," using live as an adjective; though why this should afflict him, we confess ourselves unable to understand. He is also deeply perplexed because we speak of the "nobilities of the human soul;" being something,

apparently, he has never heard of. We also are as much perplexed to know why this disturbs him. He even furnishes us with an erratum for the printer, noticing that the letter "n" is somewhere omitted from the word "spoken." All this is the more kind, since the writer himself has no little difficulty in making his sentences march, and would seem to need all his grammar and rhetoric for his own use. Thus, at the very beginning of his article, he indulges in the following extraordinary sentence:—

"That a man by the name of Theodore Parker, the reputed author of one of these publications, and concerning whom the rest are written, once lived among us and is now dead, we are led to believe, partly in consequence of the principles of faith by which we receive the Bible as the word of God, however much in some of its parts it may fail to coincide with our instincts,—which were Mr. Parker's ultimate test of truth."

We have always supposed it to be one of the rules of good writing, that each sentence should contain one leading thought. But this sentence contains no less than five thoughts, the last of which has wandered off so far from the first as to have quite lost sight of it. It says, (1) We believe that Theodore Parker lived and is dead; (2) We believe it partly in consequence of certain principles by which we receive the Bible. (3) By these principles, we receive the Bible as the word of God. (4) We receive it as such, though it may fail in some parts to coincide with our instincts. (5) Instincts were Mr. Parker's ultimate test of truth.

It seems at first to have been intended by the writer to say in this introductory sentence, that he believed that a certain person once lived; but, by the time he reached the end of the sentence, we find him making a statement in regard to that person's ultimate standard of truth. The

sentence reminds us of Mr. Emerson's description of a Western carriage-road, which sometimes "changes into a horse-path, which ends in a foot-path, which at last terminates in a squirrel-track, and runs up a tree."

We shall await with much interest the result of the experiment about to be tried by this "Review" upon the dry bones of John Calvin. When they become "living and fresh," we shall make haste to inform our readers of that fact; and when the writer of the article we have noticed has any more advice for Unitarians, ecclesiastical or grammatical, we shall inform them of that also.

REVELATION:

ITS SUBSTANCE, ITS METHOD, ITS EVIDENCE, ITS OBJECT.

IN a discussion of this question to which we recently listened, it was said (according to the view which prevailed extensively during the last part of the eighteenth century, — the view taught by such men as Paley and the leading divines of the English Church) that *the substance* of revelation was *truth*; *the method, language*; *the evidence, miracles*; and *the purpose, salvation*, or human goodness. It was maintained that the substance of revelation was intellectual, and not emotional; some principles or ideas perceived by the intellect as truth. These ideas could only be distinctly perceived, if expressed in words: language, therefore, is the means by which revelation takes place. That these ideas are revealed by God, can only be shown by miracles: miracles, therefore, are essential to authenticate revelation. And the object is to save the soul, by giving it a knowledge of its duty and destiny, without which it is incapable of finding its way to heaven.

This view of revelation has the great merit of consistency and completeness. Like all such consistent and complete systems, it was the product of an age, not of a man. It was not made: it grew. When made, it wholly satisfied the needs of the time: no intellectual wants then existed which it did not satisfy. But the progress of the age has unfolded other needs, and there are thousands of thinking men whose souls remain unfed by this system. But such systems are necessarily so consistent with themselves, that they cannot be disproved in detail. They are like a coat of chain-armor, every link of which is impenetrable: it must be unclasped, and taken off altogether. The only way to refute such a system is to present another in its place. We shall endeavor to do so; not expecting, however, to do more than to suggest hints toward the formation of another theory of revelation. The theory which is to satisfy the intellectual wants of the nineteenth century, like that which satisfied the wants of the eighteenth century, cannot be made, but must grow.

1. *What is revelation?* It is God unveiling himself to man. *The substance*, therefore, of revelation, is not a statement or a proposition about God; but it is God himself. This is necessary; for otherwise revelation would not produce knowledge, but only opinion or belief. We believe a proposition: we know reality. Now, knowledge is everywhere insisted upon, in Scripture, as the essential result of revelation. We know God through Christ. Revelation, so far as its contents are intellectual, is not belief, but knowledge; the sight of great realities; the personal experience of divine things. *The substance, therefore, of revelation, is God himself*, and not statements or opinions about him.

2. *The method of revelation is not language, but inspiration.* So far as God reveals himself to man through

man, it is by inspiration. This is not communicating verbal statements to the understanding in the form of propositions, but giving visions of truth to the soul. The soul of man has powers of insight, of intuition; and to these powers God appears manifested. The essence of inspiration is a spiritual experience; an impression made on the soul of the seer. This impression he analyzes, and puts in language; but this analysis and language are no part of the original revelation.

That this is so, appears from the fact that revelation is knowledge. Knowledge comes, not by a verbal statement, but by a mental experience. The verbal statement may be the occasion of the experience; but it is not any thing more. The feeling of certainty which belongs to knowledge is born out of experience alone. Only outward experience, through the senses, gives knowledge of external things, or material substance: only inward experience, through intuition, gives knowledge of inward things, or immaterial substance.

3. What, then, is *the proof of revelation*? what the evidence that this mental experience is an impression made on the soul by God? This question evidently includes two: What is the evidence to the inspired person that his inspiration is genuine? and What the evidence to others of that fact?

Now, it will not do to make miracles the only test of revelation, unless we are prepared to deny the revelations which Scripture asserts to have been made to those who did not work miracles. It is nowhere asserted that Noah, Abraham, or the patriarchs worked miracles; though we are taught explicitly that important revelations were made to them. The great prophets who revealed to the Jews the coming reign of the Messiah, and who prepared its way by their magnificent descriptions, — Isaiah, Jeremiah,

Ezekiel, Daniel, — were not workers of miracles, unless the last be an exception. Shall we say that prophecy is itself a miracle? This does not help the argument; since the miracle could only have been known to be such after Christ's coming, — that is, after the work of revelation was accomplished.

Another reason why miracles cannot be made the essential and proper evidence of revelation is, that other evidence is necessary to prove any work, claiming to be a miracle, to be really such. On the theory before us, a miracle is a violation or suspension of a law of nature; and it authenticates the man who performs it, as a divine ambassador, because only God can suspend a law of nature. But there is always this difficulty: that we can never know, concerning any event in the natural world, that it is a violation of natural law. It may be the action of some hitherto undiscovered law; it may be deception; it may be illusion; it may be preternatural or diabolical. Few miracles recorded in the New Testament appear to us more astonishing than it would have seemed to Seneca or Virgil to have received a message in Rome, sent from Corinth, by Mæcenæ or Gallio, one minute before; to see a severe surgical operation endured without pain; or to have their portraits taken by sunlight in a few seconds. We believe in the miraculous facts of the New Testament as differing from these events, and as resulting from the power of God; but we believe the miracles on the ground of Christianity, and not Christianity on the ground of miracles.

The evidence of revelation to him who receives it is necessarily inward and experimental: to others, the tree is known by its fruits. When God draws near to the soul of the prophet, and fills it with light, peace, strength, and love, he knows that this voice in his heart is divine, because it conveys with it the idea of the Infinite and Perfect.

What shall be the evidence to others that God has revealed himself to Moses or to Christ? There is no one exclusive evidence: the evidences of revelation are numerous. The good which comes from it is one essential proof. Men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles. All real, profound, and permanent good comes from the influence of God. To the individual, the evidence of revelation is that it reveals; that it shows God; that it puts the love of God into his heart, the knowledge of God into his mind, and obedience to God into his will.

The universal belief in Christianity as a divine religion does not come from the sources to which theologians ascribe its origin, nor does it rest on the foundations where they have placed it. They have built up with care an elaborate and artificial argument in its behalf; but the real belief of men does not rest at all on that basis. If there were not a more substantial foundation, the building would long since have fallen to the ground. The theological proof of Christianity resembles the columns which modern architects place in halls and churches, which have no constructive meaning, but only an ornamental one. They look as if they supported the roof; but, in fact, the roof supports them, and is itself supported by the walls. When any one examines his own mind to find what is to him the real proofs that Christianity is of God, he will find that these proofs are, that it is to him God's voice; that it lifts his soul to God, unveils eternity, shows immortality, sets before the soul an ideal of perfect virtue, touches the heart with a vision of infinite love, rouses the conscience by the sight of a perfect law, and gives higher strength for the fulfilment of all duty. If I am asked why I believe that the sun reveals to us the aspects of nature, I say, Because I see them by means of sunlight. If I am asked why I believe that Christianity is a revelation of spiritual

truth, I answer, Because I see this truth by Christ-light. The sure proof of revelation is *that it reveals*.

The miracles of Jesus are part of his work and life. They belong to his character, and cannot be eliminated from it. Even those miracles which Orthodoxy, in the last century, explained away, coming rationalism will accept as facts. The phenomena of modern Spiritualism will probably confirm that doctrine of demoniacal possession which the theology of the last century treated as a Jewish error. The miraculous conception of Christ will, in like manner, be probably seen to be a fact, connected with a higher system of divine influence. Miracles will occupy their true place in Christianity hereafter, not as its corner-stone, but as a part of the building itself.

Nicodemus held a theory of miracles somewhat like that of Paley. "I know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no one can do the miracles which thou doest, except God was with him." Nicodemus believed in Christ on the ground of miracles. But our Saviour gave him to understand, that, so far from believing Christianity on that ground, *he could not even see it*, except by a proper direction of his spiritual nature.

There is an historic proof of revelation also, which grows stronger with every century of earthly existence. We now admit that God has revealed himself partially to all races of men, and that there is more or less of revelation in all human religions. The Brahmin sees the spirituality of God, and His absolute being. The Buddhist sees that God acts by law: he sees an order, though not a living order, in the universe. The disciple of Zoroaster sees the moral nature of God, — that he loves good, and hates evil. The Greek saw God manifest in nature, as Beauty. All the religions of the earth are fragments: Christianity is a whole, including in its universality all of their partial truths.

This is an evidence of Christianity as divine revelation, to the force of which every year will add something. The more fully that we recognize some truth in every human religion, the more entirely we shall recognize that all these truths are harmonized in Christianity. If Christianity is found to include the special truths scattered through all other systems, and to bring them all into a living harmony, the conclusion is irresistible, that Christianity is the universal religion of man. If so, Christ is shown to be the true spiritual King of the whole human race; that is, the Messiah, or Christ, of God. This proof of Christianity, — which has never been fully unfolded, — though it takes some time to be thoroughly known, is perhaps the most satisfactory of all, after it is known.

4. *What is the purpose of revelation?* The object of all revelation is to give *life* to the human soul, by showing the truth and the love of God. In revelation, God comes to us in order to bring us to him. The purpose of revelation is not knowledge merely, but knowledge joined with love so as to produce life. That view of revelation which makes its object to teach certain truths with authority to the intellect is by no means satisfactory. This view is inadequate, since it omits that which Christianity declares the essential purpose of the gospel: "I have come that they might have life." Or, if it admits life as part of the purpose of the gospel, it reverses the order; making life come from light, and not the reverse. The gospel says, "In him was life, and life was the light of men:" we say, "Light is the life of men." The apostle says that love builds up, but that knowledge puffs up. Knowledge will certainly come out of love; but love will not certainly come out of knowledge. The life of man is in his love. He who loves the earth has an earthly life: he who loves God has a divine life.

THE ALBANY TRACTS.

ALTHOUGH Brooklyn enjoys the name of "the City of Churches," we doubt if there is a more *religious* town than Albany in the Union. Like Boston, it is a trimountain city. On its central hill stands the Capitol, flanked on the north and the south; on the two other eminences, by two immense cathedrals. These look down on seventy or eighty smaller churches, — Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. In an obscure street, apparently hid away, stands the Unitarian Chapel, where Rev. A. D. Mayo preaches. His congregation is composed about equally of persons heretofore known as Unitarians and Universalists. Such is what may be called the missionary station of Liberal Christianity to New York. That it is an important point, the very key of the State, we verily believe. Mr. Mayo, during his five years' ministry there, seems to have so considered it. He has preached and is preaching for the State as well as for Albany; welcoming every opportunity to speak in the cities and towns around him and throughout the State.

By the publication of thousands of pages of tracts, sermons, and lectures, distributed with persistent and judicious care, this little society has sought to second the efforts of its pastor.

As a local effort, no extraordinary success has been developed, counting the number of the congregation; but as a missionary station, while less has been done than was required, the labor and sacrifice given have not been unavailing.

West and south of the Connecticut River, all Liberal Christian societies should be missionary stations; aiming as much to preach through the types as through their ministers. Your readers, perhaps, have become tired of

hearing and reading about the importance of circulating Channing's works, and books, sermons, tracts, and newspapers advocating Liberal Christian views; yet this is the great work of the *present* generation at least. Albany, to some extent, has acted under that conviction. I wish I could say, "She has done what she could."

B.

THE SECOND SOCIETY IN PHILADELPHIA.

NEW YORK, Feb. 27, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR, — Having heard a good deal of the opening of a fine field of labor in Philadelphia, in the Kensington District of the city, I went on a week ago to *prospect* the ground. You are aware that a second Unitarian society has, on two or three different occasions, been started in Philadelphia, with indifferent success for a short time, and then with blank failure. A year and a half ago, another effort was made, with prospects of success. About \$1,700 were raised and expended upon the project, — \$1,200 coming from the New Society, \$250 from Dr. Furness's Society, and \$250 from the American Unitarian Association. A minister was settled, a pretty regular congregation of a hundred and fifty persons gathered, and a promising root struck into the fresh soil. The sickness of the minister, with other causes, blighted this hopeful plant; and, after a few discouraging attempts to collect the people about a transient ministry, the society closed its doors, and added another seeming failure to our missionary efforts in the Quaker City.

A few ardent friends, however, have never abated their faith in the success of a second society; and, after every

failure, with new experience have only entertained larger and firmer hopes of victory, when the cause should be properly led.

I will give you the plain story of my own impressions: they cannot be worth much, based on so short an experience; but they are worth something. At the earnest petition of the trustees (who, by the way, have never disbanded), I went on to Philadelphia to see what number of people could be gathered together under the standard of the Second Unitarian Society at short notice, and what could be done to re-inspire them with confidence in themselves and their cause. I expected to meet a hundred people, and I think the trustees did not expect two hundred. The morning service was attended by at least five hundred; the evening by, say, seven hundred. The hall would have been *called full* in the morning: in the evening *every seat* seemed occupied, excepting a gallery at the rear. I am willing to consider half this congregation as the fruit of curiosity, or of causes not to be counted constant; but I am very confident, from the aspect and bearing of the people, that half of it was there from sympathy with Unitarian views and a hunger and thirst for our doctrine. This was evidenced in the private conversations held after services with the people, and confirmed by the testimony of the trustees, who knew very nearly what portion had come from Dr. Furness's Society (a very small number in the morning), and who were stragglers or curious visitors. Most of the people were those who, at one time or another, had attended on the meetings of the Second Society. The hunger for the Word, as we interpret it, was very marked, and left on my mind a strong conviction that the materials for a large society exist in Kensington, and will be readily collected and organized whenever a competent and devoted minister is placed at

the head of the energetic and self-sacrificing handful, who, through good report and evil report, maintain the ground. There are, happily, many Fort Sumters in this treacherous and seceding world of ours; and one of them is found in the germ of the Second Society in Philadelphia.

Success will be sure, rapid, glorious, for the right man in that field: there will be none at all for the wrong one. The faculties required to start successful congregations in large communities are not the highest, nor the best, nor the most lasting; but they are rare and indispensable. Courage, tact, popular eloquence, denominational zeal, constitutional enthusiasm, are more necessary than scholarship, weight of judgment, exactness of thinking, or nicety of taste. For a time, every thing must give way to the power of winning attention and holding the hearers together. Always supposing a genuine religious character, a man with these gifts is sure to succeed anywhere; and in Kensington must greatly and rapidly and gloriously succeed, if all the indications are not deceptive.

Philadelphia is the second city in the Union. It has two opposite elements, both highly favorable to our cause: the prevailing element, an eminently bigoted Orthodoxy, which the excellent Mr. Barnes has not, with his admirable life and teaching, yet fought down; which of course arouses much active opposition of thought and feeling, and makes Liberal Christianity very necessary and very acceptable to a large minority. The other element is Quakerism, which is sympathetically kindred, in its Hicksite branch, with Unitarianism; and, in the present generation, leans strongly to our mild formalism.

Dr. Furness has labored for thirty-five years in Philadelphia, and made for himself and his cause a world-wide name and place. The influence of his ministry has been very deep and broad. He has shed a light throughout that

whole community, by the splendor of his genius, the brightness of his life, and the charity of his peculiar opinions. It is not for us to say of such a man, that he has not fulfilled the very mission of all others most pressing and most useful. His sense of duty and the leanings of his spirit have, however, led him to think the office of spreading Unitarianism very secondary to other matters; and, of course, this leaves room for one who thinks that office worthy his highest and first exertions. There is a demand for positive, doctrinal Unitarianism in Philadelphia.

But, apart from the need of another and the original type of Unitarianism, there is a great deal of ungathered Liberal religious sentiment there, waiting to be churched. The wide spread of the city makes one society inadequate to its wants. We cannot doubt that ample materials for a second society exist amongst those already acquainted with Unitarian views.

It is hardly worth while to enter upon any more general considerations; but can the importance of planting our churches in the great cities and centres of influence be overstated? The present is a peculiarly open season. The recent discussions provoked by the slavery question have loosened religious prejudices, aroused inquiry, and made the radical differences of sentiment between Unitarian and Orthodox views practically apparent. The direct connection between our theology and our politics and business and practical living is beginning to be made obvious to the people at large. What has been hitherto a scholastic or merely ecclesiastical discussion is destined to become a popular and practical debate. Never, perhaps, were the prospects of Liberal Christianity so promising as now,—never, the opportunity of arousing the public attention to it so inviting. Let this season be seized upon to plant new churches in the centres of influence; and let earnest, warm,

and courageous men, with enterprising hearts, go forth from the regions where Unitarianism is well understood, into the frontier parts of the country, where it still surprises and refreshes thousands of intelligent minds when ably proclaimed, and reproduces its early enthusiasm and reaps its old triumphs.

The American Unitarian Association cannot, I am sure, give its assistance to a more deserving cause than that of the second Unitarian congregation in Philadelphia; nor could its sagacity and influence be better employed than in sending some thoroughly competent minister from the crowded neighborhood of Boston to that society, to lead their cause.

Respectfully and fraternally yours,

HENRY W. BELLOWS.

TO J. F. CLARKE, *Gen. Sec. A. U. A.*

IN MEMORIAM.

Died in Hingham, Feb. 9, Mrs. J. C., wife of Rev. Daniel Bowen.

ONLY a little more than thirteen months have elapsed since our beloved friend Mrs. Bowen was introduced as the bride of our new pastor. It was on the evening of his ordination-day. All the parish assembled to welcome them both. Mrs. Bowen was a stranger; but such was the sweetness of her manners, and fitness of her deportment, towards all, that all went from her presence sure they had found in her a friend. The old man of fourscore and the little child of four years rejoiced that they had seen her. It was the power of self-forgetfulness, the legitimate result of a heart tenderly awake to the welfare of all to whom her influence might extend, that made her the bless-

ing she was to the whole parish. The sick and neglected knew they had in her a sympathizing friend. The children of the parish cherish her memory with affection; for, in this "little year," she had fixed her throne in their hearts. To her Sunday-school class she went with the same devotedness which she carried into every duty; and those little ones who gathered around her will not soon forget the accents of loving wisdom which fell from her lips. On how many world-worn spirits her words of affectionate interest fell as dew upon the parched ground, softening their hearts! "How strange it is," said one of these, "that Mrs. Bowen cares so much for me! She always says some pleasant thing that makes me feel happy whenever I see her; and she seems to do it because she cares for me, and cannot help doing it." This was the secret of that power which her every word possessed. She gave *herself*; never forgetting, "the *gift* without the giver is bare." It was this atmosphere of love diffused over her whole life that caused her departure from earth to put, not the parish only, but the whole community, in mourning. We feel that a sacred presence is withdrawn, that we are poorer, now that she is gone. With her undimmed spiritual vision was combined a deeper intellectual culture than is often found. Her discrimination of character, her discernment of ethical distinctions, was delicate. Her love of nature was a pervading influence. There was nothing in her manners that we wished to alter. Other persons have excellences at the expense of defects; but her character was symmetrical. Now that she is gone, our tender love has become a kind of worship. It will be long before the memory of that "tenement of clay," still beautiful with the impress of the departed spirit, will fade from our hearts. We have spoken of her only in relation to the parish and the community at large. If *our* sorrow is

so profound, what must be the anguish in that sanctuary which was her home? May our stricken friend realize, in his sad loneliness, that the purity which loved him on earth still continues to love him in that higher sphere to which she has gone!

A PARISHIONER.

LETTER FROM ROCKFORD, ILL.

DEAR BROTHER, — You may like a few words about our little society at Durand.

I preached to them once in four weeks for a little more than a year, discontinuing my appointments Nov. 18.

The attendance was larger at the last meetings than it was in spring and summer: but the inconvenience of winter travelling, in a buggy or on horseback, twenty miles, after preaching in Rockford, to preach *one discourse* in the evening; and the fact that the Congregational minister is not more than *semi-Orthodox* in his preaching, and, in general, gives our people good satisfaction; and the additional fact, that they have in the library you sent and the books I have given them an abundant supply of good reading, — altogether made it seem expedient to have at least a “winter vacation;” and so I discontinued my appointments, as I have mentioned.

The Methodist system of itineracy has supplied what preaching there has been in many of the rural districts so long for nearly or quite nothing, that a very large proportion of the people, who are abundantly able to give from ten to fifty dollars, think they are generous if they put ten cents into a collection, or subscribe a dollar for a

year's preaching; and many more evidently think they are conferring a great favor on the preacher — particularly if he is not Orthodox — in going to hear him.

Such people *need* the gospel of Christ more than they desire it; but, to outgrow their present moral and spiritual stature, they require a nutritious diet for a considerable length of time.

I mention these facts that you may comprehend, in part, the condition of things in a large proportion of our Western country; and why bright visions of speedy and grand success sometimes end in very quiet and moderate results. I should like to write such letters as I have sometimes seen published about the open-armed welcome awaiting the preacher of Unitarian Christianity in the West, and invite the strong reapers to come, and thrust in the sickle, and reap the ripe harvest; but, *between this and that*, I see some "grubbing" and "prairie-breaking" and "seed-sowing" to be done yet.

But, in other directions, there are cheering indications of the progress of our cherished sentiments and of a more catholic faith.

The Universalists met in Chicago a short time ago, and organized a North-western Conference; and are now earnestly at work to raise \$10,000 as a fund for missionary operations. When they got together, they confessed their sins of misdirected effort and of neglected duty to one another, and evidently meant what they said; and are intent on a more worthy exhibition of their faith by their works. God bless them for doing what we ought to be doing for Liberal Christianity!

Mr. Goodwin's sermon on the "Divinity and Humanity of Christ One and the Same," which I sent to you, is a specimen of what is going on in many of our so-called Orthodox churches.

We have, in the First Baptist Church in Rockford, a man who talks strangely Liberal sometimes, and as strangely Papal in tone at others.

And, among the Methodist clergy, I often hear of things strongly indicative that Channing's works have got into the library of the North-western University, if not into their own bookcases.

I wish I could do something to increase a little the list of subscribers to the "Monthly Journal," in response to your circular: and intend to try to get some of the ladies to work for it; but I do not expect great success.

Most affectionately yours,

A. H. CONANT.

THE FIRST UNITARIAN ORDINATION IN WISCONSIN.

MILWAUKIE, March 1, 1861.

DEAR SECRETARY, — Having just returned from the ordination of Brother Stone at Fond-du-Lac, let me write you a little about it. Fond-du-Lac is a pretty place, as you know. Its name signifies "bottom of the lake;" in this case, Lake Winnebago, of which it is not the bottom, — being two or three feet above its water-level, — but at the lower end (or *one* end) of which it is. You remember how the old trees stand forest-thick all over the city; and how sweetly the white houses with green blinds look, in among them. Four thousand inhabitants manage to live very comfortably, and work industriously, and trade very successfully, in this "bottom of the lake." The census did great damage to this city (as to all our Western Londons), driving away some two or three thousand inhabitants; but, as figures are again forgotten, they will speedily return to

us. You can get to the "bottom of the lake" twice a day, by rail, from Chicago, Milwaukie, and the rest of the world; and once in due time, by water, all the way from Boston. I saw in the river, at Fond-du-Lac, an old steamboat, which used to run on the Alleghany River between Franklin and Pittsburg. Ask your boy Eliot to show you how it was done; for I doubt if you know.

Brother Stone, then, is in as pretty a place as ever a stone was in; and a place, withal, where a stone is much needed to raise the church above the "bottom of the lake" (the above are all puns upon Fond-du-Lac). On the twenty-sixth day of February ultimo, Brother Collyer of Chicago, Brother Conant of Rockford, Brother Rice and six of his parish from Berlin, and Brother Staples from Milwaukie, met to ordain Mr. Henry Stone Pastor of the Free Congregational Society of Fond-du-Lac.

The sermon was by Rev. Mr. Staples, upon "The Field and the Work of Liberal Christian Churches in the West," from Matt. iv. 4: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

The "field" is one of tendency, and not one of confirmed character. Its present condition is not the result of false development so much as a state of envelopment.

Its "work" is *not*, first, to cripple nor abate the great life of the West. It is essential to power; and, unless there is power, there is nothing for religion to guide. It is easy to tame a weak horse, but not of much use: we prefer the wild, full life, though it handle us roughly in the breaking. If we cannot take *all the life* of the West, and lead it into the service of the kingdom of God, let us confess, either that we have misunderstood the kingdom of God, or are unequal to the work which it demands of us.

Our purpose is not, secondly, to limit the spread of the truth to the acceptance of any given forms. If any change

in these matters is to be made, now is the time and this the place to make them, when and where all is plastic. If the old bottles will not hold the new wine, let us try new bottles. We shall be obliged to make some change in our church methods. It would be strange indeed, if church means which were first adapted to the semi-heathen churches of Corinth or Ephesus, some of whose members we should send to the police, needed no re-adjustment to suit our new conditions and necessities. It was the speaker's conviction, that the demand of the West was for less, not more form; that, if the church of the future assumes any historic type, it will come nearer to the Quaker than to the Catholic.

Our purpose is not, thirdly, to fight Orthodoxy, save as it comes in the way of what we are aiming at. The negative effects of our *calmest* positive statements will be sufficiently destructive.

But we seek the complete development of the Western life. We would teach the people that man must not, cannot, *live* by bread alone. In all this hurry of material life, we would have them hear the deeps calling unto deeps in their souls. We would awaken that hungering for life which all the words of God feed and satisfy. The satisfaction of this awakened appetite will give a test of the Apostolic Church, the accredited forms, the authoritative truth: it will find God's word in creation, in the human soul, in Christ, in all the good and great of all time.

The ordaining prayer was by Brother Collyer. It was unlike any prayer of ordination which I ever heard. Indeed, it seemed to me, as his spirit warmed with the presentation of his thought before God, as if it was the first ordaining prayer that I had ever heard.

The charge was also by Collyer. It was a charge to be a *good man*; to take care of the body, that being the condition of rightness; to live in the sympathies and

love of his people; to be teachable, and swift to hear the promptings of a heavenly wisdom; to be fervent in spirit. They found, in the old shop where he used to work, that the secret of a new engineer's success, in giving them more power from the same engine than the former one had done, was that he kept his grates clean, and a centre of white-heat in the heart of the furnace. "So, brother," said he, "I charge you to keep your spirit clean, that the air of heaven may be drawn through it, and your heart kept glowing with the white-heat of devotion."

The right hand of fellowship was given by the Rev. Mr. Staples; Brother Reid being unable to attend church, from sickness.

The address to the people was by Brother Conant of Rockford. It was plain truth, spoken earnestly, but in love; full of such things as a people ought to hear, but things which it is a little uncanny for a pastor to say.

With a benediction by the pastor, ended what I think was the first ordination of a Unitarian minister ever witnessed in the State of Wisconsin. Let us hope that the end is not yet.

But this taste of brotherly communion proved so sweet, that we felt much disposed to prolong it as long as possible. So, finding out that Brother Collyer was charged with a sermon on Inspiration, we resolved it should be discharged, and gave notice that he would preach on the following evening. We spent the day as none but Unitarian ministers, who have travelled a hundred miles for the purpose, can spend a day together. In the evening, Brother Collyer preached from the first verse of the first chapter of Luke, and the last verse of John.

The sermon was very radical, very conservative, very sound, and very inspiring. No man can feel the religious necessities of this Western world for a few years, without

preaching such a sermon upon that subject, *if* he is able. It is absorbing all others, at present, in interest; and the fate of the Bible among us hangs upon the answer given to the question, "How is the Bible inspired?" *Can* a text of Scripture be made to block the wheels of a reform which the mind and heart and conscience of society are demanding? Brother Collyer showed the obvious marks of individuality in the different writers, and found no evidence of miraculous endowment, nor of infallibility in the fruits of their inspiration; yet he claimed for them the highest inspiration possible to man, but such in kind as all may partake of. The most sensitive mind could not have been in the least degree offended by the discourse, so immersed was it in the spirit of reverence and love.

Thus ended a happy meeting, from which we returned to our homes with new strength and hope. You cannot easily understand how it rejoices our hearts to welcome each new laborer in this great field. Brother Stone has as good an opportunity for the full devotion of his powers to the best uses as ever a man had. The society have a new and handsome church, capable of seating some seven hundred persons. The community is all alive with free thought, and hungering for the bread of life; and all whom I met spoke in the highest terms of Mr. Stone.

We have work enough for several more good men. Cannot you send us some live man, whose soul is open to the whisperings of Providence; who can feel and appreciate our new conditions, and make the most of them; and, above all, one who is neither queer nor distinguished nor foolish?

Yours fraternally, MILWAUKEE.

In my next, I will give you some account of my labors in the country around me.

H Y M N.

[In church, Jan. 6, 1861. The sermon is upon the text, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God!"]

Now, with the newly opening year,
Once more to this our Zion hill,
With prayers and praises drawing near,
O God! we come to do thy will.

Here in our holiest holy place,
Where broods thy sacred Spirit still,
Where we have seen thee face to face,
O God! we come to do thy will.

Whether the days advancing now
With joy or grief our cup shall fill,
We only will repeat this vow:
"O God! we come to do thy will."

What barren husks do we not eat!
How thirst, how hunger we, until,
Craving thy service for our meat,
O God! we come to do thy will!

What ask we, then, of grief or joy?
Thy flock can know not, fear not, ill:
Their peace no trials can destroy,
O God! who come to do thy will.

And so, as at a Master's call,
Eager thy mandates to fulfil,
Vying to serve thee first of all,
O God! we come to do thy will.

As soldiers who their armor wear,
Prompt at the trumpet's summons shrill,
This legend on our shields we bear:
"O God! we come to do thy will."

As children in a Father's home,
Whose hearts at his kind accents thrill,
Thy love constraineth us: we come,
O God! — we come to do thy will.

ONE OF THE LAITY.

IN THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS.

To suffer for others, or enjoyment for ourself, — which of these two is the greater, the more enduring? I ask myself this question, because of an ocean of sin and suffering on every hand, because of daily temptation, and because of the cross of Christ. The determination towards suffering for others, or happiness for self, requires some plan and system: it can never be wholly spasmodic or accidental. And we see in ourselves and others every day how thoroughly the latter becomes a plan of life, and how often it fails. As a principle of action, it can be neither great nor enduring; but, when we study the nature of *suffering*, — of that quality which was created from the very heart's-blood of our Saviour's sacrifice for the sins of the world, — we can understand how such a grief should belong alone to an elevated love, and prove the seed and vital principle of an enduring happiness.

If we look deeply into sin, and the many forms of distress all about us, we find that, to reach a cure, we can do nothing without giving the love which alone is born of suffering; and how can such a love spring up in the heart, unless through a profound knowledge of the divine gift of love to us in Jesus, — *of love to us*, for whom he gave himself?

Unless our human hearts bleed, as did his divinest nature, for those steeped in the sin of ignorance, of oppression, for the outcast and the enslaved, how can we have courage to reach them, raise them, and bless them?

And there are temptations to neglect duties which are more personal, — our duties to those whom we love; and how often does love itself become selfish, and work bitter harm!

We may love one, and without injury to one's self, who may, nevertheless, be injured incurably by it: through peculiar circumstances, our influence may be the very worst. And how hard it is to see this! how our self-love hides or glosses over the terrible fact! How can we say, "My love will hurt him: I must withdraw all outward manifestation of it"?

Not till we rise so high as to suffer for his injury shall we be able to make this great sacrifice, which will at last expand and grow into a Christ-like love.

And as the sublime form of our Lord smiles on us, through all these earthly claims and sympathies, with ineffable love and joy, may we not dare to believe that the sacred shadow of his cross has fallen upon us? and may we not hope to be strengthened and enlightened as his instruments of wide-spread good, and at last, perhaps, expect to know what happiness, that deserves to be such, really is?

AN INCIDENT IN LONDON. — CHURCH HOSPITALITY.

DEAR SIR, — I find, in your "Monthly Journal" of February, President Hill's account of his early experiences in seeking a seat at a Boston Unitarian church.

Having already been interested, on a similar account, in behalf of those abroad, it may be well to state the arrangements I found there.

One Sunday in London, our friend Mr. Channing was to preach at a church remote from us. The name as well as the person were widely attractive; and we were glad to answer several invitations to hear him, at the small expense of a very long walk.

Using, however, no names at the door, we were at once recalled from the floor of the church by the terrified attendant, who would not compromise himself by promising us better success anywhere. Unusually fatigued, we paused, before ascending to the galleries, quite long enough for our position to be thoroughly understood by many of the congregation. All were far too nice to overstep that English *gaucherie*, which, once broken down, yields to such generous liberty.

To the gallery, then, despite our mute appeal, we perforce ascended, and became comparatively comfortable in an empty pew. Just before the opening of the services, a lady entered, alone, the further extremity of the long pew in which we occupied two seats. She maintained a moment's uneasy silence; then gently addressed us:—

“Really, I believe this is *not* a public seat.”

“Can you tell us, madam, where we *may* sit?” I hinted here. “We have already been turned from the floor.”

“Possibly, near the organ?” she questioned rather than replied, with a glance at a long array of empty benches.

On the bare forms in front of the organ, and facing the clergyman, we had certainly no cause of regret, save the nervous sensation of intrusion; which, however unreasonable, it is often difficult entirely to control.

Some weeks later, during a conversation with Lady —, a chance allusion to my own Unitarianism produced an instant declaration of hers. I found, to my mortification, that it had been possible for me to form a strong attachment, without a single expression to evince a faith so unusual in London. Her ladyship spoke with great warmth; and said, that, among her friends, she was quite alone in this belief. She added, that her husband had kindly taken her from a great distance expressly to hear Mr. Channing. They were unable to gain admittance; and, to her most heavy disappointment, were obliged to drive from the door.

Perhaps you will allow me to pursue the subject with a respectful inquiry. *Are* the minor virtues so inefficient in our pilgrimage, that Christian flocks so widely scattered appear to be ignorant of their plainest requisitions? How may we be led to the large deductions which might be drawn from the "cup of cold water"?

And surely, in these cases, the clergy themselves are partly responsible for the *customs* of the church, where every door should be open to him who, hearing, will come, or to him who cometh that he may hear. I know to whom I address myself, and am confident of the kind construction which will be used in my behalf.

K. M.

INTELLIGENCE.

MR. BENJAMIN H. BAILEY was ordained as pastor of the Society in Dedham, Mass., on Thursday, March 14. The introductory prayer was offered by Rev. J. H. Morison, D.D., of Milton; Rev T. B. Forbush, of Northborough, read selections from the Scriptures; the sermon was preached by Rev. Convers Francis, D.D., of Cambridge; Rev. Alvan Lamson, D.D., the former pastor, offered the ordaining prayer; Rev. Joseph Allen, D.D., of Northborough, gave the charge; Rev. John D. Wells, of Quincy, the right hand of fellowship; Rev. George E. Ellis, D.D., of Charlestown, the address to the people; and the concluding prayer was offered by Rev. Calvin S. Locke, of West Dedham.

MR. HENRY STONE, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of 1860, was ordained as pastor of the Society in Fond-du-Lac, Wis., on Tuesday, Feb. 26. A full account of the services on this occasion will be found in the letter of our correspondent "Milwaukee," on another page.

REV. THOMAS DAWES, having resigned his office as pastor of the Hawes-Place Society, South Boston, closes his labors on the last Sunday in March.

THE ordination of Mr. William H. Savary, as pastor of the Society at West Newton, Mass., will take place on Wednesday evening, April 10. Rev. O. B. Frothingham, of New York, will preach the sermon.

REV. EDWARD C. TOWN has accepted a call to become the pastor of the Society in Medford, Mass. Mr. Town closed his engagement at South Braintree, which was for one year, on the last Sunday of March; having declined an urgent invitation to renew it.

THE Unitarian Society in Charleston, S.C., has advertised for a pastor. The pulpit, temporarily supplied at present, will be vacant on the third Sunday in April. Applicants are requested to address "the Chairman of Wardens of Unitarian Church, Charleston, S.C., Key Box 16."

REV. JOSEPH H. PHIPPS, of East Bridgewater, has received and accepted a call from the Society in Kingston, Mass., to become their pastor.

REV. D. H. RANNEY has resigned the pastorate of the Society in Bernardston, Mass.; and has been invited to supply the pulpit of the Society in Walpole, N.H., for eight months, commencing with the first Sunday in April.

REV. C. H. A. DALL expected to leave Calcutta for this country the last of February. He will come by the way of England, where he will spend several weeks, and will reach Boston about the 1st of June. He visits America on a vacation, by the advice of his physician; having become much prostrated by his severe and long-continued labors in a tropical climate.

A LETTER from California, in the "Christian Inquirer" of March 23, gives the following information:—

"I would state that Mr. King yesterday (Feb. 7) remarked in an earnest sermon, that, if the debt of the church should be paid by the 1st of May, he was willing to say that he would remain another year, nor even to limit his time to that one year. As the debt *will* be paid, please therefore consider our distinguished brother as renewing his engagement with us."

AT a monthly meeting of the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held just before Mr. Gangooly

left London on his return to India, the following resolution was unanimously passed by a full Committee:—

“*Resolved*, That this Committee cannot allow their Hindoo brother, JOGUTH CHUNDER GANGOOLY, to leave England without recognizing the value of his labors in this country in exciting an interest in the Indian Mission; that they would assure him of their sympathy and of their best wishes for his welfare, and pray that God may enable him to be faithful in the solemn and important work to which he has been set apart by their brethren in America.”

Mr. Gangooly was then introduced to the Committee, when the above resolution was read to him; and the chairman, George Long, Esq., in a few very appropriate words, took leave of Mr. Gangooly, and expressed the cordial wishes of all present for his future usefulness and success.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

Christian Examiner, March, 1861.

The last number of the “*Christian Examiner*” contains several articles to which we would call attention. One is upon the recent book of Max Müller upon Vedic literature. This article is by Prof. Whitney of Yale College, who is not only the first Sanscrit scholar of America, but one of the first in the world. Prof. Whitney has been some years engaged, in connection with one of the most eminent German scholars, in editing one of the Vedas in the original text. This article, therefore, deserves the best attention from all students who desire to make themselves acquainted with the latest results of Vedic studies.

Another important article in this number is on the relation of reason and faith, occasioned by a notice of Bunsen and his works. It contains the substance of Dr. Hedge’s sermon at New Bedford last October. Regarding the article, therefore, as a sermon, no less than as an essay, we must express the opinion, that it alone would place the writer at the very head of his profession. There is no one else whom we know, in our own denomination or in any other, who could write a discourse, which, in all the qualities of profound thought and happy expressions, would bear comparison with this. In its immediate

effect upon a congregation, it might be inferior to the fervid flow of Huntington, the vivid and electric effects of Beecher, or the sweeping force of Bellows. Nor is it a sermon to compare with those of Dr. Putnam, considered as a concentration of effective thought to produce a single practical conviction. Robertson's sermons, which we rank, on the whole, as highest for the purposes of sermons, — combining more religious experience with more analytic thought than any others, preaching with the spirit and with the understanding also, — never attempt, so far as we remember, any such profound, and at the same time comprehensive, survey of a subject, as this. One is affected, in reading it, as by the sight of those deep and rapid currents, where, at every moment, the water rushes from below to the top, boiling up from beneath, with indications of forces at work beneath the surface. In this sermon, single sentences and single words hint at processes of original thought and results of long study. It is not shallow in some places and deep in others, like the Ohio, — fordable here and there, with large sand-bars often intersecting it, but resting here and there in long blue levels, which sleep like lovely lakes, fringed with forests and overhung with hills; but it rolls steadily onward, the same vast volume, like the Mississippi, which is of the same apparent width and power from Kentucky to New Orleans. The diction of this discourse is as brilliant as the substance of it is profound: no one else has such command of language, such happy and suggestive expressions. This discourse, therefore, which seems to us the best thing the author has written, places him easily at the head of all writers of sermons, with whom we are acquainted, in the qualities described; nor is there any other, like or second, in this style.

The Gospel Liturgy. Prepared by Direction of the General Convention of Universalists.

None of the liturgies prepared among Liberal Christians has perfectly satisfied the great body of those who desire to worship in the liberty wherewith Christ maketh free, in the love which fulfilleth the law, in the order which ministereth reverence, and in the fulness of spirit of a quickened faith. Each approach to what is a manifest want of the new church demands grateful acknowledgment. The Universalist manual, prepared by one of their most esteemed pastors (Rev. A. C. Thomas), has some decided advantages, which make it a valuable assistant to ministers, if not so easily introduced into congregations as that used by the "Church of the Disciples" and by many scattered congregations.

One recommendation is the tunes printed at the end, so as to be of service in vestry-meetings, thirty in number. Another is

the provision for various occasions not considered in most of our liturgies, — Sunday-school teachers' meetings, dedications and installations, family worship, the sick and the dying, Good Friday and Pentecost, &c.

A third advantage is, that some, not all, of the services, are superior to any with which we are familiar, — that for baptisms especially, — and refreshing by their variety from older forms. The prayers might have been better: they need more of a personal Christ. Excellent in brevity, they should have more of the venerated words of "the Book." The hymns seem the most open to criticism: old favorites, like "The Lord is my Shepherd," are supplanted by modern lays of far less beauty and power. Still the "Liturgy" is a valuable addition to the complete one yet to appear.

H.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1861.

Feb. 25.	From Society in Brighton, for Monthly Journals . .	\$27.00
" "	" Society in Wayland, for Monthly Journals . .	7.00
" 26.	" Society in Peterborough, N.H., as a donation . .	22.45
" "	" Society in Dublin, N.H., for Monthly Journals . .	10.00
" 27.	" Rev. Horatio Stebbins's Society, Portland, Me., for Monthly Journals	15.00
" 28.	" sale of Tracts	5.86
" "	" scattered subscribers to Monthly Journal in Fe- bruary	69.55
Mar. 1.	" Society in Fitchburg, for Monthly Journals . .	55.00
" "	" Society in West Roxbury, for Monthly Journals . .	15.00
" "	" "F." Chicago, Ill., for India Mission	6.25
" 5.	" Society in South Danvers, for Monthly Journals, additional	5.00
" 6.	" Society in Leicester, for Monthly Journals . .	10.00
" 7.	" a friend in Keene, N.H., for packages of Tracts, to be sent to the West	3.00
" 8.	" Society in Staten Island, N.Y., for Monthly Jour- nals	12.00
" 9.	" Rev. Nathaniel Hall's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals	68.00
" 11.	" Society in North Easton, for Monthly Journals . .	30.00
" "	" Rev. Dr. Ellis's Society, Charlestown, for Monthly Journals	70.00
" 12.	" Crosby, Nichols, Lee, & Co., for Monthly Jour- nals	33.25
" 13.	" Society in Cohasset, for Monthly Journals . .	21.00
" 14.	" Second Society, Brooklyn, N.Y., for Monthly Journal, additional	1.00
" 18.	" Rev. Dr. Hall's Society, Providence, R.I., for building church in Kalamazoo, Mich. . . .	100.00
" 22.	" From a friend in Portsmouth, N.H., as a dona- tion	5.00

CANDIDATES FOR SETTLEMENT.

This list will be corrected monthly. Brethren desiring their names entered, or address changed, will please indicate the same to the Secretary of the A. U. A.

The * affixed to the word "Boston" indicates the address, — "Care of American Unitarian Association, Boston."

Preachers.	Address.
Ira Bailey	Bolton.
Stephen Barker	Concord, Mass.
Geo. Bradburn	Athol.
F. L. Capen	Care of Barnard Capen, Esq., Boston.
William Cushing	Clinton.
Gerald Fitz Gerald	Cambridge.
J. H. Fowler	Cambridge.
William Ware Hall	Providence, R.I.
John K. Karcher	Boston.*
Lyman Maynard	Milford, Mass.
D. C. O'Daniels	Richmond, N.H.
George Osgood	Montague.
J. M. Peirce	Cambridge.
Thomas H. Pons	Boston.*
D. S. C. M. Potter	W. Bridgewater.
James Richardson	Boston.*
Charles Ritter	Care of "Christian Inquirer," New York.
Charles Robinson	Groton.
Ed. G. Russell	Cambridge.
A. S. Ryder	Hubbardston.
John Savary	Cambridge.
George W. Stacy	Milford.
Augustus Steinhart	Cambridge.
Livingston Stone	Cambridgeport.
Wm. Law Symonds	Boston.*
L. G. Ware	Boston.*
Daniel S. Whitney	Southborough.
George A. Williams	Deerfield.
Samuel D. Worden	Lowell.
William C. Wyman	Brooklyn, N.Y.